



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

XI. — *Observations on Mr. John Crawford's Paper on the European and Asiatic Races.* Read before the Ethnological Society on February 13th, 1866. By DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.

[Read March 27th, 1866.]

I FEEL very thankful to Mr. Crawford and the Council for allowing me to make a few observations upon Mr. Crawford's paper "on the European and Asiatic Races."

Mr. Crawford tells us, in illustration of the mental inferiority of the Asiatics, that in the seminaries at eighteen the native is left far behind by the European, and never after recovers his lost ground. What are the facts? Only a few mails ago, *The Friend of India* tells us, that at the Calcutta University there were then above 1200 candidates for entrance; 447 underwent the first examination, and that 120 had applied to compete for the B.A. degree. *The Friend* remarks, "These examinations are assuming a Chinese magnitude, and present a spectacle at once curious and gratifying." The result of my own experience as a teacher and professor for ten years in the Elphinstone Institution, and of my observations for ten years more, is entirely contrary to Mr. Crawford's statement. Gambier, Perry, Lewin, Sims, Warden, and others, have given similar opinions in their evidence before Parliament. The mistake made by Mr. Crawford is one of those which foreign travellers and writers are very apt to fall into from superficial observation and imperfect information.

When English seminaries were first opened in India, boys were principally sent there with the object of acquiring a sufficient knowledge of the English language to enable them to get situations in government offices, or to talk and write in English. The consequence was, that for some time these seminaries did not produce any scholars, the pupils generally leaving on attaining their main object. With the imperfect education with which they usually left school, and falling again in the society of their own equally or more ignorant countrymen, they were not able to continue their studies. Those Englishmen, however, who watched their progress, but did not understand the cause, wondered at such result, and concluded that the native youth was incapable of progress after eighteen. There is another circumstance which unfortunately aggravated the mischief; the custom of early betrothal and marriage among the natives. The pupils, therefore, were often fathers before they were eighteen or twenty, and the

necessity of supporting a family soon drove them from school to service.

For those who take a real interest in the natives of India, I cannot do better than refer them to that mass of interesting evidence given before Parliamentary Committees by interested and disinterested persons, and I have no doubt that any impartial and candid inquirer will find that the natives of India are not below the average of the head and heart of any other nation in the world.

This evidence was given in 1853 and 1858; but since that time the progress in education and several other matters has been so marked, though not very great, that even this evidence has become obsolete in some particulars. No careful observer will now make the statement that the Hindu is not capable of keeping up his studies after leaving college, much less that he falls back at eighteen and never regains his lost ground. The very fact that the Hindus were even capable of producing a vast and varied literature in all departments of human knowledge, shows beyond all doubt that the capacity to study all life is not wanting. The fertile soil is there, but neglected. Let it have its proper cultivation, and it will again shew the same fruit.

Lastly, as Sir C. Trevelyan very justly remarks, what is said about the natives takes place in some degree in all countries, even in England, and as a remedy, he says,—“The main thing required is to open to them a proper field of mental and moral activity in after life . . . and we should encourage a wholesome mental activity in the pursuits of literature, science, and the fine arts . . . all the avenues of employment in the service of the state should be opened to them.\*” They have very considerable administrative qualities, great patience, great industry, and great acuteness and intelligence.”†

I do not know whether the remarks made by Mr. Crawford on Asiatic literature and dearth of great names are based upon his own personal knowledge of all these literatures, or on the authority of others who possess such knowledge, or on the assumption that, because Mr. Crawford does not know them, therefore they do not exist. Mr. Crawford himself admits that there have been some conquerors, lawgivers, and founders of religious sects. I suppose such names as Christ, Mahomed, Zoroaster, Manu, Confucius, Cyrus, Akbar, Fardoosi, Hafiz, Sady, Calidas, Panini, Abool Fazil, and a host of others, are such as any nation may be proud of. The Royal Asiatic Society has a descriptive catalogue of 163 manuscripts in their library of 100 distinct Persian and Arabic works on the single subject of history. Sir W. Jones thinks

---

\* Lords' Committee, 1853, ques. 6644.

† Ib. 6605.

(vol. x, p. 349) Persia has produced more writers of every kind, and chiefly poets, than all Europe put together. He mentions a manuscript at Oxford of the lives of 135 of the finest Persian poets.

Mr. Crawfurd speaks disparagingly of the *Shahnameh*; I hope Mr. Crawfurd has read it, or has authority for what he says. In my humble opinion, from what little I know of it, it is a work of great poetic merit.\* Sir W. Jones, after giving the palm of superiority to Homer, asserts a very great resemblance between the works of these extraordinary men; and admits that both drew their images from nature herself, and both possessed, in an eminent degree, that rich and creative invention, which is the very soul of poetry (vol. x, p. 355).

He considers the characters in it as various and striking; the figures bold and animated, and the diction everywhere sonorous, yet noble; polished, yet full of fire (vol. x, p. 354). Sir J. Malcolm thinks that the most fastidious European reader will meet with numerous passages of exquisite beauty in the noble epic poem of Firdoosi; that some of the finest scenes are described with simplicity and elegance of diction, and that to those whose taste is offended with hyperbole, the tender part of his work will have most beauty (vol. ii, p. 539). Sir W. Jones considers that the Persian language is rich, melodious, and elegant; that numbers of admirable works have been written in it, by historians, philosophers, and poets, who found it capable of expressing with equal advantage the most beautiful and the most elevated sentiments (vol. v, p. 165). With reference to the ridiculous bombast of the Persian style, he remarks, "that though there are bad writers, as in every country, the authors who are esteemed in Persia are neither slavish in their sentiments, nor ridiculous in their expressions."

Upon Mr. Crawfurd's remarks as to the absence of any literature or history among the Persians before the Arabian conquest, let us see what Sir John Malcolm says. He says the Arabs, in their irritation at the obstinate resistance of the Persians for their independent religion, destroyed their cities, temples, etc., etc. And the books in which were written whatever the learned of the nation knew, either of general science, or of their own history and religion, were, with their possessions, devoted to destruction." He refers, as a parallel, to the fate of Greek and Roman manuscripts, to show how few of the works of a conquered and despised nation like Persia would be saved amid the wreck to which that kingdom was doomed.

---

\* Dr. Julius Mohl informs me that he has already published four volumes of the text and translation; the fifth is nearly ready for publication, and the sixth is printing.

He further says,—“We know from sacred history, that the deeds of the kings of Persia were written in a work styled the Chronicles of that Kingdom; and we are told by a Grecian author, who was at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon, that he had access to volumes which were preserved in the royal archives.”\*

I need not take up your time with more extracts on the merits of other poets. Mr. Fraser, after naming Nizami, Omar Keyormi, Oorfi, and Rudki, says he might cite a hundred others as high examples of genius. Lastly, we must bear in mind, that a large amount of Asiatic and European literature may have been lost in that deplorable act of destruction of the Alexandrian Library by Omar.

In Arabic literature, to the *Arabian Nights* at least, I hope Mr. Crawford accords some merit; for according to his test of merit the work is translated in European languages, and extensively read, too. Chrickton's *History of Arabia* gives an account of a varied and vast Arabian literature. He thinks Europe indebted to the Arabs for some of her most valuable lessons in science and

\* Mr. Ed. B. Eastwick, in reply to my inquiries as to his opinion upon the extracts I have given from Sir W. Jones and Sir John Malcolm on Persian literature, etc., says:—

“I thoroughly agree in the opinions expressed of Firdausi, and of the Persian poets, by Sir W. Jones and Sir J. Malcolm. The narratives of events in the *Shanaméh* are not so unnatural, hyperbolic, or absurd as those in the *Iliad*, and the ‘curiosa felicitas verborum’ of the Persian poet is little if at all inferior to that of Homer. Mr. C. cannot be aware that M. Mohl has translated the *Shanameh* into French, and that Atkinson has rendered some portions into English. If Arabic and Persian were taught in our schools, as Greek and Latin are, we should have as many and as careful translations of the *Shanaméh* as of the *Iliad*. It is not the slender merit of the poet, but our ignorance of Persian, that has made the dearth of translations. As yet we have only dipped into Persian poetry. No European can pretend to have explored that ocean of literature.”

I am sorry that my very slight knowledge of French prevents me from studying, for the present, the annual reports of Dr. Julius Mohl; but I give below an extract from his letter to me, which I think gives the Eastern literature its proper place in the history of man.

“Oriental literature can only take its place in the universal literature of mankind, when intelligent historians show its value for history in its largest sense—history of the development of the human race, its ideas, its manners, etc.; and show, too, how large has been the past of the East, and how great in some respects its influence. This is gradually being done, in proportion as translations and researches on special subjects put the materials in the hands of thinking people. It is, above all, the history of religion, of legislation, of philosophy, and of poetry, which will show the importance of Oriental literature; but it is slow work, and cannot be otherwise, by the nature of the case. Greek and Latin literature will always prevail in Europe; our minds have been moulded upon them, and they are nearest to us: but this does not extinguish the claim of the East to take its place. I have said this over and over, in my annual reports to the Asiatic Society.”

arts. He also gives the names of more than half-a-dozen female poetesses and philosophers.

Professor Max Müller thinks that the achievements of the Brahmins in grammatical analysis, which date from six centuries before Christ, are still unsurpassed by any nation (*Science of Language*, p. 80). Colebrook thinks that among the infinity of volumes on Nyaya, there are compositions of very celebrated schoolmen (*Religion and Philosophy of the Hindus*, p. 167), and that the Hindu writings abound in every branch of science. Sir W. Jones strongly recommends to Europeans the study of Indian medical works. He says there are many works on music, in prose and verse, with specimens of Hindu airs in a very elegant notation, that the Sanscrit prosody is easy and beautiful, that there are numerous astronomical works, and that wherever we direct our attention to Hindu literature, the notion of *infinity* presents itself, from which we may gather the fruits of science without loading ourselves with the leaves.

No doubt there may be much leaves and branches, or much trash, in this vast forest of literature, but we know also what amount of trash is daily poured upon us in the present day.

Sir W. Jones ventures to affirm that the whole of Newton's *Theology*, and part of his *Philosophy*, may be found in the *Vedas*, which also abound with allusions to a force of universal attraction (vol. iii, p. 246). With regard to the Sanscrit language, he says, "whatever be its antiquity, it is of wonderful structure, more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either" (vol. iii, p. 34). With all the above opinions of Sir W. Jones Dr. T. Goldstucker concurs.

Horace Wilson thinks it probable that in fiction much of the invention displayed on the revival of letters in Europe was referable to an Indian origin (vol. iii, p. 156); that enough has been ascertained to determine the actual existence in Sanscrit or in vernacular translations from it of a very extensive literature of fiction, in which many of our European acquaintances are at once to be recognised (vol. v, p. 108), and that the Hindus occupy an early and prominent place in the history of fiction (vol. iii, p. 159); that in speculations upon the nature of the superior being and man, the Hindus traverse the very same ground that was familiarly trodden by the philosophers of Greece and Rome (vol. ii, p. 115). He also remarks:—"That in medicine, as well as in astronomy and metaphysics, the Hindus once kept pace with the most enlightened nations of the world; and that they attained as thorough a proficiency in medicine and surgery as any people whose acquisitions are recorded, and as indeed was practicable, before anatomy was made known to us by the discoveries of modern inquirers. That surgery (as well as other departments of

medical science, was once extensively cultivated and highly esteemed by the Hindus."

Lastly, I appeal to Professor Goldstucker, whether Sanscrit literature was not important enough to warrant the formation of the Sanscrit Text Society, headed by his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

Further development was checked by the frequent invasions of India by, and the subsequent continuous rule of, foreigners of entirely different character and genius, who, not having any sympathy with the indigenous literature—on the contrary, having much fanatical antipathy to the religion of the Hindus, prevented its further growth. Priesthood, first for power and afterwards from ignorance, completed the mischief, as has happened in all other countries.

Mr. Crawford tells us that the Asiatics are untruthful, very inferior in morals, and have no fidelity to engagements. Beginning with the ancient Persians, Zoroaster, hundreds of years before Christ, taught, "I understand truth-telling exalted; all the days of the holy man are with thoughts of truth, words of truth, and deeds of truth." Those that tell untruths and do wicked actions shall not receive the reward of life from Hormuzd. "To speak true words is true excellence; in the treasures of religion exalt truth above all." What is the high religion?—That which promotes my holiness and truth, with good thought, word, and deed. "In this house may . . . prevail words of truth over words of lie."—"Punish the breakers of promise, and those that induce others to break their promise."\* Coming down in the course of time to the third century of the Christian era, Ardai Viraf, a high priest, holds out the punishment of hell, among others, to the following:—

"The man who used false weights and measures, took full weight and returned false, who adulterated his goods by mixing water with milk, to men who were liars and tale-bearers. The crime of lying being the most displeasing in the sight of God; even the most trivial and innocent falsity being a heinous sin. The man who was a bearer of false witness; who was fraudulent and deceitful; who, though he kept his word and rigorously performed his agreement with those of his own sect and faith, yet held it no sin to break his faith with those of a different persuasion; this, in the eye of Omnipotence, being a heinous sin, and the keeping of a promise even with an enemy being a duty inculcated."

Mr. Pope, the translator of Ardai Viraf, concludes with the following remark, "that the philosophers will rejoice to find

---

\* My paper on the Parsee religion read before the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society.

them (the modern Parsees) neither deficient in virtue or morality." Mr. Rawlinson says, "that in their (Zoroasterian) system, truth, purity, piety, and industry were the virtues chiefly valued and inculcated."

Coming down to the latest times, the Parsee children are taught as a religious lesson to speak the truth, and not to tell untruths nor to commit treachery.

The above is the testimony of the religious literature of Persians. Let us see what foreigners have said of them. Greek testimony about Persians is to be taken with care and caution. When we see that in the nineteenth century, gentlemen of learning and authority, with every means of obtaining correct information available, commit such mistakes as the one I have pointed out before, about the educational capacity of the natives of India, and make statements contrary to well known facts, how much more necessary is it to sift carefully the testimony of a hostile people given at a time when intercommunication was rare and difficult, and the character and manners of the two people very different. Even good Greek testimony, however, is in the favour of the Persians. Herodotus says, "Their sons are carefully instructed . . . to speak the truth." He also says, "They hold it unlawful to talk of anything which is unlawful to do; the most disgraceful thing in the world they think is to tell a lie, the next worse to owe a debt, because, among other reasons, the debtor is obliged to tell lies."\*

Next, there is the testimony of the inscriptions in which lying is taken as the representative of all evil. Darius's successors are exhorted not to cherish but to cast into utter perdition the man who may be a liar or who may be an evil doer.† The modern Parsees are admitted by Mr. Crawford himself, as well as others, as a trustworthy and truthful race.

Of the modern Mahommedan Persians of Persia I do not know much. But I may say this much, that if they be truthful, Mr. Crawford's statement, then, is incorrect; if untruthful, Mr. Crawford's conclusion of his paper is so far upset. For, the present untruthful Persians, being the descendants of an old truth-speaking race, the difference in the character is no proof of difference of race, and that external circumstances have great influence in modifying a nation's character.

About the Hindus I can speak, both from personal knowledge and from other testimony, that Mr. Crawford's charge against them is unfounded. This mistake also arises from causes I have alluded to before—superficial observation and hasty conclusions. Fortunately there are many who have studied the native character more carefully. Not to take up much of your time, I

\* Rawlinson's "Herodotus," vol. ii, p. 222.

† Ib. note 7.



refer you to the evidence given before Parliament, 1853 and 1858, and I think that a careful and candid examination of that evidence will satisfy anybody, that the general character of the natives of India is as good as that of any other people.

I shall very briefly refer to some of this testimony here. Beginning with the early writers, Strabo testifies to the truthfulness and virtue of the Hindus (vol. iii, p. 106). Arrian also describes the Hindus as truthful (Sykes's *India*, p. 121). Coming down to later times, Abool Fazil, the celebrated Mahommedan minister of Akbar, describes the Hindus in the sixteenth century as lovers of justice, admirers of truth, grateful, and of unbounded fidelity (J. Crawford's *Researches*, vol. ii, p. 139). Coming down still later to the present time, Sir G. Clerk thinks the morality among the higher classes of Hindus of a high standard, and of the middle and lower classes remarkably so. He thinks there is less of immorality than in many countries of Europe. Sir E. Perry tells us, that offences against property and crimes generally are less frequent in the island of Bombay than in any similar community in Europe, and that it is the opinion of the Hindus that native morality suffers by coming into close contact with the English—the pristine simplicity and truthfulness of the native village disappears in drunkenness, intrigue, and a litigious spirit supervening, and that their commercial integrity has always been famous.

This commercial integrity is mentioned by Strabo also, who says that “they make their deposits, and confide in one another” (vol. iii, p. 105). It is a fact at the present day, that transactions of great value take place between natives, for which there is no further evidence than the entry in the books of the seller. I do not suppose there is any parallel to this in Europe.

Colonel D. Sims considers the natives not inferior to the people of other countries in point of honesty, and even veracity, and says that people are apt to judge of the natives of India by those whom they find about the precincts of the different courts of justice, where, temptations to mendacity being many, the atmosphere is unfavourable to truthfulness, as is probably the case in any other countries under the same circumstances. When Mr. Fowler, a planter, gained the confidence of his labourers by his fair dealings with them, everything went on smoothly, and he was never in any part of the world where he had less trouble with his labourers.\*

---

\* In Mr. Justice Phear's opinion, “the character of the average oral testimony in the Guildhall of London, and that of the same in the town-hall of Calcutta, were on a par.” And the Hon. Mr. Campbell fully admits that it was the courts which were to blame for the character of native testimony. (*Native Opinion*, Bombay, 25th March, 1866.)

Horace Wilson tells us "not to imagine that the Hindus are ignorant of the foundations of all morality, or that they do not value truth, justice, integrity, benevolence, charity, to all that lives, and even the requital of evil with good ; that these duties are all repeatedly enjoined, and Hindu authorities commend as earnestly as those of any other language" (vol. ii, p. 109).

The complaint often made about untruthfulness of natives, has, I think, this cause. There are several professional experts about the courts who sell their evidence. The judge is very often not sufficiently familiar with the vernacular ; some of the subordinates in the court being most wretchedly paid, yield to the temptation of bribery, and these three causes combined together make the task of the judge sometimes difficult, and every instance of successful perjury naturally encourages it more. The obvious remedy, one would think, would be that if proper severe examples were made of the perjurers, instead of merely raising up the cry of untruthfulness against the whole nation, their number, if at all unusual, would soon be reduced.

The other cause of the Hindus being sometimes denounced as untruthful, is the following clauses in the *Institutes* of Menu.

Chap. iv, 138. "Let him say what is true, but let him say what is pleasing ; let him speak no disagreeable truth, nor let him speak agreeable falsehood. This is a primeval rule."

139. "Let him say 'well and good', or let him say 'well' only ; but let him not maintain fruitless enmity and altercation with any man."

Chap. viii, 103. "In some cases, a giver of false evidence from a pious motive, even though he know the truth, shall not lose his seat in heaven : such evidence wise men call the speech of the gods."

104. "Whenever the death of a man, *who had not been a grievous offender*, either of the servile, the commercial, the military, or the sacerdotal class, would be occasioned by true evidence, *from the known rigour of the king, even though the fault arose from inadvertence or error*, falsehood may be spoken : it is even preferable to truth." (The italics in all extracts from Menu are from the commentators on Menu.)

It must be remembered that these are laws for a state of society entirely different from your present one ; the will or wisdom of the sovereign is the practical law of the land. I do not propose here to read a dissertation on truth, but I may simply, as parallel to the above extracts from the works of a Hindu legislator, refer to what is said by some of the European thinkers of modern times. Bentham allows, 1, falsehoods to avoid mischief, the case of misdirecting a murderer ; 2, falsehoods of humanity, the case of physicians ; 3, falsehoods of urbanity, an exaggerated compliment. In these cases, or at least in the first two, he says, "falsehood is a duty ; in other cases it may be allowable, as in all those in which the person addressed has no right to know the truth. This would embrace most of the cases discussed by Grotius and Puffendorf." Instead of making any further quotations, I refer

you to an article in the *Saturday Review* of July 2nd, 1864, on "Lying," from which the above extract is given.

I give in a note below extracts from the *Institutes of Menu* to show how highly truth is valued among the Hindus. Dr. Goldstucker kindly writes to me to say, that in Rigveda and Jagurved "the necessity of speaking truth and avoiding untruth is emphasised in the most beautiful language, but unfortunately there are as yet no translations of these texts."\*

\* Chap. iv, par. 175. Let a man continually take pleasure in truth, in justice, in laudable practices, and in purity; let him chastise those, whom he may chastise, in a legal mode; let him keep in subjection his speech, his arm, and his appetite.

Par. 237. By falsehood the sacrifice becomes vain.

Par. 256. All things have their sense ascertained by speech; in speech they have their bases; and from speech they proceed: consequently, a falsifier of speech falsifies everything.

This is somewhat similar to Bentham's description of truth, in his *Theory of Legislation* (p. 260): "Every instant of our lives we are obliged to form judgments and to regulate our conduct according to facts, and it is only a small number of these facts which we can ascertain from our own observation. Then results an absolute necessity of trusting to the reports of others. If there is in these reports a mixture of falsehood, so far our judgments are erroneous, our motives wrong, our expectations misplaced. We live in restless distrust, and we do not know upon what to put dependence. In one word, falsehood includes the principle of every evil, because in its progress it brings on at last the dissolution of human society."

Par. 255. For he, who describes himself to worthy men, in a manner contrary to truth, is the most sinful wretch in this world: he is the worst of thieves, a stealer of minds.

Chap. vi, par. 92. Content, returning good for evil, resistance to sensual appetites, abstinence from illicit gain, purification, coercion of the organs, knowledge of Scripture, knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, veracity, and freedom from wrath, form their tenfold system of duties.

Chap. vii, 26. Holy sages consider as a fit dispenser of criminal justice, that king, who invariably speaks truth, who duly considers all cases, who understands the sacred books, who knows the distinctions of virtue, pleasure, and riches.

Chap. viii, par. 79. The witnesses being assembled in the middle of the court-room, in the presence of the plaintiff and the defendant, let the judge examine them, after having addressed them altogether in the following manner:

Par. 80. What ye know to have been transacted in the matter before us, between the parties reciprocally, declare at large and with truth; for your evidence in this cause is required.

Par. 81. A witness, who gives evidence with truth, shall attain exalted seats of beatitude above, and the highest fame here below: such testimony is revered by Brahma himself.

Par. 82. The witness who speaks falsely, shall be fast bound *under water*, in the *snaky* cords of Varuna, and be wholly deprived of power to *escape torment* during a hundred transmigrations: let mankind, therefore, give no false testimony.

Par. 83. By truth is a witness cleared from sin; by truth is justice advanced: truth must, therefore, be spoken by witnesses of every class.

Mr. Crawford admits the commercial integrity among native merchants. Dealings in money, however, produce the greatest temptations to dishonesty, and when the commercial portion of a nation can stand this ordeal well, one would think it must tell much in favour of the general character of a people.

Par. 84. The soul itself is its own witness; the soul itself is its own refuge; offend not thy conscious soul, the supreme internal witness of men!

Par. 85. The sinful have said in their hearts: "None sees us." Yes; the gods distinctly see them; and so does the spirit within their breasts.

Par. 89. Whatever places of torture have been prepared for the slayer of a priest, for the murderer of a woman or of a child, for the injurer of a friend, and for an ungrateful man, those places are ordained for a witness who gives false evidence.

Par. 90. The fruit of every virtuous act, which thou hast done, O good man, since thy birth, shall depart from thee to dogs, if thou deviate in speech from the truth.

Par. 91. O friend of virtue, that supreme spirit, which thou believest one and the same with thyself, resides in thy bosom perpetually, and is an all-knowing inspector of thy goodness or of thy wickedness.

Par. 92. If thou beest not at variance, by speaking falsely, with Yama, or the subduer of all, with Vaivaswata, or the punisher, with that great divinity who dwells in thy breast, go not on a pilgrimage to the river Gangâ, nor to the plains of Curu, for thou hast no need of expiation.

Par. 93. Naked and shorn, tormented with hunger and thirst, and deprived of sight, shall the man, who gives false evidence, go with a potsherd to beg food at the door of an enemy.

Par. 94. Headlong, in utter darkness, shall the impious wretch tumble into hell, who, being interrogated in a judicial inquiry, answers one question falsely.

Par. 95. He, who in a court of justice gives an imperfect account of any transaction, or asserts a fact of which he was no eye-witness, shall receive pain *instead of pleasure*, and resemble a man who eats fish *with eagerness*, and swallows the sharp bones.

Par. 96. The gods are acquainted with no better mortal in this world, than the man of whom the intelligent spirit, which pervades his body, has no distrust, when he prepares to give evidence.

Par. 97. Hear, honest man, from a just enumeration in order, how many kinsmen, in evidence of different sorts, a false witness kills, or incurs the guilt of killing.

Par. 193. That man who, by false pretences, gets into his hands the goods of another, shall, together with his accomplices, be punished by various degrees of whipping or mutilation, or even by death.

Par. 257. Veracious witnesses, who give evidence as the law requires, are absolved from their sins; but such as give it unjustly, shall each be fined two hundred panas.

Chap. x, par. 93. Avoiding all injury to animated beings, veracity, abstaining from theft, and from unjust seizure of property, cleanliness, and command over the bodily organs, form the compendious system of duty, which Menu has ordained for the four classes.

Chap. iv, par. 170. Even here below an unjust man attains no felicity; nor he whose wealth proceeds from giving false evidence; nor he who constantly takes delight in mischief.

Chap. v, par. 109. Bodies are cleansed by water; *the mind is purified by*

Mr. Crawfurd denies integrity even to the educated classes. I do not hesitate to give a direct contradiction to this statement. From my actual acquaintance and experience of the educated natives in the Bombay Presidency, I can with confidence assert, in Mr. Crawfurd's own words, that integrity is most prevalent among them as among the educated in Europe. This mistake about the integrity of the educated is also like that about the capacity for education. There are many youths who know how to speak and write English without being educated, and Englishmen often confound them with the educated.

*Polygamy.*—The Parsees are strictly monogamists. The old and young, the most bigoted and the most orthodox, all agree in their abhorrence of bigamy. They prevailed with government to make bigamy criminal among them. I am not able to refer to the books, but I have a strong impression that there is nothing in the religious literature of the Old Persians indicative of the prevalence or sanction of polygamy among them. It is the most universal belief among the modern Parsees that they have always been monogamists, and they consider concubinage, also, a sin. Greek testimony, however, is against the Persians in this matter. But at the same time the Greek best authority lays the blame upon the Greeks themselves, for Herodotus tells us, "as soon as they (Persians) hear of any luxury they instantly make it their own, and hence, among other novelties, they have learnt unnatural lust from the Greeks. Each of them has several wives and a still larger number of concubines." It appears, then, that we have to thank our good friends, the European Greeks, for this unnatural lust. The magi of the Medes are charged with worse institutions than polygamy by some Greek authorities, but Mr. Rawlinson says, "whether it had any real foundation in fact is very uncertain" (vol. iii, p. 131).

The *Desatir*, which in some parts is, according to some, of great antiquity, and according to others only a work about three

---

*truth*; the vital spirit, by theology and devotion; the understanding, by clear knowledge.

Chap. ii, par. 97. To a man contaminated with sensuality, neither the Vedas, nor liberality, nor sacrifices, nor strict observances, nor pious austerities, ever procure felicity.

Chap. vii, par. 13. Let the king prepare a just compensation for the good, and a just punishment for the bad: the rule of strict justice let him never transgress.

Chap. viii, par. 111. Let no man of sense take an oath in vain, that is, not in a court of justice, on a trifling occasion; for the man, who takes an oath in vain, shall be punished in this life and in the next.

Par. 86. The guardian deities of the firmament, of the earth, of the waters, of the human heart, of the moon, of the sun, and of fire, of punishment after death, of the winds, of night, of both twilights, and of justice, perfectly know the state of all spirits clothed with bodies.

hundred years old, but, withal, the work of an Asiatic, says, "Marry only one woman, and do not look with a wicked eye on or cohabit with any other woman." This fact deserves much consideration. Had the Persians been originally polygamists it is strange that, during their residence in India for 1200 years in the midst of the Hindus and Mohammedans, who are more or less polygamists, they should have so strictly preserved their monogamic character.

I asked Professor Spiegel to point out any texts in the religious literature of the Parsees, for or against, polygamy. He replied, "As far as my knowledge goes, there is no instance of polygamy in the religious literature of the Parsees. It is said that Zerdusht had three wives, but he had them successively. I share with you the conviction that the majority of the Parsees were at all times monogamists, although, perhaps, indulgences have been granted to kings and other individuals of high station." In another reply to further inquiry from me, about these indulgences, he repeats that there is not a single text of the *Avesta*, or the later *Parsis*, which alluded to polygamy, and that the indulgences he referred to were upon Greek and Latin authority.

Moreover, Sir J. Malcolm thinks, "There is every reason to believe that the manners of the ancient inhabitants of Persia were softened, and in some degree refined, by a spirit of chivalry which pervaded throughout that country from the commencement till the end of the Kayanian dynasty . . . . The great respect in which the female sex was held was no doubt the principal cause of the progress they had made in civilisation; these were at once the cause of generous enterprise and its reward. It would appear that in former days the women of Persia had an assigned and an honourable place in society, and we must conclude that an equal rank with the male creation which is secured to them by the ordinance of Zoroaster, existed long before the time of that reformer." I can say, in confirmation of this, that, even among the old and most orthodox in the present Parsee society, the above remarks on the respect to the female sex are true, and to the best of my recollection I can confirm the remark of the equality of rank of the female and male creation by the ordinance of Zoroaster.

Mr. Rawlinson also thinks the Aryan races seem in old times to have treated women with a certain chivalry, which allowed the development of their physical powers, and rendered them specially attractive alike to their own husbands and to the men of other nations.

The existence of polygamy among the Hindus cannot be denied, but on reading the *Institutes* of Menu, I think that any

one will be satisfied that, short of a perfect equality with man, and strict monogamy, woman has high consideration shown her. Menu says, "When females are honoured then the deities are pleased, but when they are dishonoured then religious acts become fruitless" (chap. iii, 56). The duties enjoined to husbands and wives are as good as those of any other people. They are summed up in the following words:—"Let mutual fidelity continue to death" (chap. ix, 101); this, in few words, may be considered as the supreme law between husband and wife. I give below a few more extracts.\*

Strabo says of the Hindus, "and the wives prostitute themselves, unless chastity is enforced by compulsion." This bears evident mark of a hasty conclusion from some partial observation. Domestic matters are always most difficult to be ascertained by a foreigner. Certainly the people who not only considered chastity a high virtue, as I have already shown, but even a power, and represented it so in the drama, cannot be charged with such degradation.

Damayante, on being insulted by a hunter in the forest, uttered loud her curse of wrath:—(*Story of Nala*, p. 35.)

"As my pure and constant spirit swerves not from Nishadha's Lord,  
Instant so may this base hunter lifeless fall upon the earth!  
Scarce that single word was uttered, suddenly that hunter bold  
Down upon the earth fell lifeless, like a lightning-blasted tree."

On the subject of chivalry among the Hindus, Sir Bartle Frere, in a speech at the distribution of prizes to the girls' schools of the Students' Literary and Scientific Society of Bombay, says to the natives around him (Stud. Lit. and Scientific Society's Report for Session 1864-65), after alluding to the spirit of chivalry and its effects in Europe, "There is no doubt that our ancestors regarded the female portion of the community as the great, almost the chief instruments in bringing back civilisation to Europe. I wish all my native friends to recollect, that this spirit, although if manifested chiefly there, was not confined to

\* Par. 58. On whatever houses the women of a family, not being duly honoured, pronounce an imprecation, those houses, with all that belong to them, utterly perish, as if destroyed by a sacrifice for the death of an enemy.

Par. 60. In whatever family the husband is contented with his wife, and the wife with her husband, in that house will fortune be assuredly permanent.

Par. 28. From the wife alone proceed offspring, good household management, solicitous attention, most exquisite caresses, and that heavenly beatitude which she obtains for the names of ancestors, and for the husband himself.

Par. 165. While she, who slights not her lord, but keeps her mind, speech, and body devoted to him, attains his heavenly mansion, and by good men is called *sádhirè*, or virtuous.

Europe. If they read any history of Rajpootana they will see that this spirit was a desire to make them as far as possible equal to this. This spirit is essentially the spirit of the old Hindu races—a spirit which subdued India and drove out the barbarous tribes of those days, and formed such communities, that they are now, after the duration of many centuries, still vigorous and still able to oppose to us a vital power, which in spite of this government and its forces can command the respect of all who go among them.”

Lastly, I beg to draw Mr. Crawfurd's attention to the phenomenon of the nineteenth century among European races of Mormonism.

It is a matter much to be regretted that gentlemen, like Mr. Crawfurd, make sweeping denunciations against the character of the Asiatics. They naturally provoke recriminations like the following, with all their mischievous consequences.

A Parsee gentleman, during his residence in this country for nearly eight years, disgusted with these sweeping charges, used to say, “Look at all the mass of untruths in the daily advertisements; in the daily language of shopkeepers; how much swindling is there in the concoction of companies for the benefit of the promoters only; see what the book on facts, failures, and frauds discloses; what extremely watchful care one is obliged to have in his dealings in the city, when every kind of scoundrelism is so rife; how many manufacturers always give you the best article only, at any price; how cleverly flaws are found in contracts; how artisans always require more time for wage-work than for job; how often you get goods different from patterns and samples;” and he asked what grounds are there for Europeans to boast of higher commercial morality than that of the natives of India? He asked, “Look at the number of immoral haunts in London, read the account of *Life in Liverpool*, see the social evil and street immorality, cases of unfaithfulness in domestic life, great immorality whenever numbers of the two sexes work together, the amount and character of crime disclosed by police and law reports, and election corruption, and all this among a highly civilised people. Is there not more reason for humiliation than boasting on the part of Europeans as to their morality? See the constant changes of views in the papers about Indian matters as it suits the purpose of the writer at the moment; the mode in which India has been acquired:—

“War, disguised as Commerce, came;  
Won an empire, lost a name.”

“When it suits their purpose the Hindus are described as most loyal, obedient, civilised, etc.; at other times they are cowardly



wretches, disloyal, ungrateful, barbarous. They first give a bad name, and then cry out to hang them. They draw millions every year from India, and in return abuse its people, caring not so much for it as for a rotten English borough. They yield with the greatest reluctance and difficulty any of their just rights and privileges demanded by the natives. Look at that iniquitous annexation policy in spite of treaties; see how the cost of the Affghan war is clapped on the shoulders of India; their whole aim being how to get most money from India." Reasoning in this way he concluded, "the only God the English worshipped was gold; they would do anything to get it," and he illustrated this by saying, "that if it were discovered that gold existed in human blood, they would manage, and with good reasons to boot, to extract it from thence."

He said "the English boast of fair play, etc., and yet see with what different measures they deal it out sometimes to the European and native; with what flagrant injustice was Dr. Colah treated; how bullying they are towards the weak, and very polite and reasonable with the strong. Coercion alone, it seems, makes them do what is right." He said that as long as an Englishman wanted anything he was the very embodiment of politeness, but the object gained, he was no more the same person, and pointing to the treatment of India generally, he thought gratitude was not a very prominent trait in the English character.

They pay native officials most wretchedly, and yet claim from them as efficient and honest service as they get from the highly-paid English officials, forgetting how rife corruption was among themselves in the days of small pay and much service. They complain of the untrustworthiness of native servants, but in their innocence they do not know how cleverly English landladies and servants manage to have their pickings and discounts.

Studying the English character in this manner, the gentleman formed his opinion that the English were the most hypocritical, the most selfish and unprincipled people, and had no right to boast of higher morality and integrity. Now, if such evidence as Mr. Crawford relies upon be conclusive as to the character of the natives of India, I do not see how this Parsee gentleman's conclusions cannot be also admitted as proved. Strange to say, the principal argument that was flung at our face against our attempt some sixteen years ago to establish female schools, was the state of English society, which the objectors, from superficial observation, urged was not highly moral, as female education afforded opportunities of secret intrigue and correspondence. I trust it is not such kind of evidence that will be considered sufficient by any thinking man to traduce whole nations.

When we left India in 1855 to come over here to open the

first Parsee firm, the principal advice given by our European friends was to be exceedingly careful in our business in the city against the many rogues we should meet with there. "In India," said some one, "we keep one eye open; in England, you must keep both eyes wide open."

In the cause of truth and science I do not in the least object to the proclamation of truth regardless of consequences; but I appeal to Mr. Crawfurd himself, and to Englishmen, whether, when in the instance of the natives of India, the case at the worst is but doubtful, such wholesale abuse of the whole nation from persons of position and authority in science is not much to be deplored; it creates ill feeling and distrust, excites recrimination, and engenders a war of races.

India, gentlemen, is in your power and at your mercy; you may either give it a helping hand and raise it to your political and enlightened condition, to your eternal glory, or keep it down with the foot of the tyrant upon its neck, to your eternal shame! The choice is in your power, and, as I am happy to believe that, true to English nature, the first course is chosen, though not yet very energetically pursued, is it not very necessary, for men of weight or influence, not to say or do anything to mar this great and good work.

Abuse from persons like Mr. Landon of Broach, or Mr. Jeffries of the East Indian Association, natives care not for. The natives know the men and their motives; but disinterested gentlemen of weight and authority ought to ponder well upon their responsibilities. I do not at all mean to say that you should not point out to the natives of India their real faults and shortcomings—in fact, you cannot do a better act of friendship; but pointing out real faults is different from traducing indiscriminately. I may demand, in the words of Horace Wilson, "Let whatever they urge be urged in charity."

In my remarks about the general moral character of the Parsees and Hindus, I do not mean to be understood that they are models of perfection, they have no doubt their fair share of black sheep also, and their faults arising from centuries of foreign rule and more or less oppression; but, judging from the experience of some past years, there is every hope of these faults being corrected by education.

The intercourse between the Europeans and natives is not, except in few instances, of that frankness and confidence which alone can enable them to judge of each other rightly. Coupled with this, they very often misunderstand each other; and the Englishman, generally being an educated man, judges of every native by the high standard of his own enlightenment and civilisation. The result is often anything but a right conclusion, and

hasty generalisation. Every wrong act of the native is at once condemned as innate in the native ; similar acts of Europeans are of course only individual delinquencies, or capable of explanation !

There is nothing strange in the natives feeling shy and misunderstanding the rulers. The other day the Welsh farmers did not fill up government returns about cattle, after deliberation, on the ground that government wanted to tax cattle.

There is no doubt that owing to a colder and more bracing climate, the enjoyment of free institutions for centuries, the advantages of high educational establishments and high moral culture, free public opinion, and the advancement in material prosperity and mode of life by the discoveries of physical science and mineral resources, the modern Englishmen is, in his physical and mental development, in his pluck and public spirit, in literature, science and arts, superior to the modern Hindu, ground down and depressed as he is by centuries of foreign rule and oppression, and possessing less advantages of climate and food for personal vigour. But the very fact that the Hindu has under all such unfortunate circumstances preserved his character for morality and virtue, for high commercial integrity, for his bravery and military aptitude, and that he has at one time produced his vast ancient lore, shows that there is no want of capacity, and that, under the influence of British rule rightly administered, and re-invigorated by modern western civilisation, he may once more regain his former high position among mankind.

At present he has not yet fully recovered from the staggering blow of the most extraordinary revolution by which a small nation in the far west has become a ruler of his vast country. He does not yet quite understand his new rulers. He is only just beginning to see dimly that after all he has perhaps some reason to congratulate himself for the change. The higher classes, the rulers now displaced or still remaining, are in a bewildering state of mind. They lying prostrate, with all their energies fled, and smarting at their fallen condition, cannot be naturally expected to reconcile themselves suddenly to the loss of their power, and to find themselves, once rulers of millions, now of less importance than an ordinary English official, and sometimes treated with injustice or indifference. The revolution in all its aspects, military, political, social, or intellectual, is so extraordinary and unparalleled in the history of mankind, that it cannot but be a work of time before a people, numbering two hundred millions, though now a fallen, but once a highly civilised nation, can be reconciled and assimilated to the new order of things. Under these circumstances, coupled with some unfortunate social barriers between the rulers and the ruled, the ignorance of each other's language, and the little interest shown by Englishmen, the Englishman and

the native of India are still at wide distance from each other, and know therefore little of each other's true merits and faults. The time, however, I hope will come, when, as some who have taken a real interest in the people have already done, the English people will with better knowledge think well of the natives of India. It will be the fault of the rulers themselves if they do not find the Hindus a loyal and a grateful people, and capable of the highest degree of civilisation. Even Abool Fazul, the minister of the greatest Mohammedan ruler of India, has borne high testimony for them. Unfortunately, the mischief of distance between the Englishman and natives is aggravated by the conduct of a class of Englishmen in India, who, either from interested motives or from pride of superiority, always run down the natives, and keep up an ill feeling between the races. Sometimes some English gentlemen claim ten or twenty years experience who have hardly been on intimate terms, or have familiarly conversed, with as many natives, or have hardly learnt to speak as many sentences in the language of the natives as the number of years they claim experience for; and such gentlemen constitute themselves the infallible judges of the character of the people. Perhaps a parallel to this to some extent is to be found in the accounts about Englishmen themselves given by European foreigners. When Englishmen are incorrectly described by these foreigners, they of course open their whole artillery of ridicule upon such ignorance, and yet it does not always occur to them that in their judgment on natives of India, with less mutual acquaintance, they may be as much, if not more, egregiously mistaken.

There are several peculiar difficulties in India in the way of rapid progress. Education permeates the mass very slowly on account of many different languages; the efforts of the educated to improve their countrymen remain confined within small limits, while in this country an idea in the *Times* is known over the whole length and breadth of the land within twenty-four hours, and the whole nation can act as a man.

The natives are sometimes charged with want of moral courage. We have only to look at the difference of treatment by the Bombay Government between a native and an English judge—I mean Mr. Manockjee Cursetjee and Mr. Anstey—and one may ask what result can be expected from such circumstances.

However, though such unfortunate circumstances do now and then occur, the educated are beginning to learn that the rights of intellect and justice are the same for all, and that though often snubbed and discouraged, they may rely upon the ultimate triumph of truth and justice.

Lastly, I think Mr. Crawfurd's treatment of this important subject is one-sided and not judicial and scientific. The paper

professes to draw a conclusion from certain facts, but to me it seems the facts are selected for, and adapted to, a foregone conclusion. All explanatory causes of difference are made light of and thrown into the background, and all tending to prove the conclusion brought most forcibly into the foreground. The whole reasoning is that, because there is a diversity in the intellectual, moral, and physical character of various nations, they must therefore have separate origins; moreover, there are several assumptions which are not correct.

In one place (p. 61) a comparison is made between different countries, and it is assumed that the greater the natural resources the greater must be the development; while a most important feature in human nature, "necessity the mother of invention," greater difficulties compelling greater exertions, and calling forth the exercise of high powers, and the bracing effects of colder climates are ignored. In one place the Phœnicians, Jews, and Mamelukes are taken over to the European side, as they seem to disturb the argument.

Mr. Crawfurd alludes to the bad governments in Asia as their own creation, as if bad governments had never existed in Europe, and no European kingdoms or empires had to thank bad governments and degeneracy for their fall.\*

One principal objection to Mr. Crawfurd's paper is an unfair comparison between the old Asiatic civilisation with the modern European civilisation, with all the impetus given to its material advancement by the discoveries of physical science, both in the arts of war and peace. The ancient civilisation of both continents may be a legitimate subject of comparison. The Asiatics, after their fall from the first civilisation, had not new blood and vigour brought to them. The Goths and other wild tribes, mainly derived from Asiatic races, permanently settled in and brought new vigour to Europe, and created a new civilisation in it with the advantages of a ground-work of the old civilisation. It would be interesting to make a fair comparison between the old civilisations of the two continents and between the modern condition of the people among whose ancestors the old civilisations prevailed. But to compare a hand armed with an Armstrong gun with an unarmed one, and thence to draw the conclusion of the superior strength and warlike spirit of the former may be complacent, but does not appear to me to be fair.

Differences in the conditions of nations and their various pecu-

---

\* In the nineteenth century, and in the very heart of Europe, a king claims "divine right", and a minister sets all law and justice at defiance. Poland and the Duchies are a strange commentary upon the political justice of Europe. Has not Italy till very lately groaned under bad governments?

liarities, arising from differences of political, physical, and social circumstances, and these circumstances reacting upon each other, require careful study and due allowance before attributing any share to innate difference.

I do not mean to undertake here the solution of the most difficult problem of the unity or plurality of races, or of maintaining or denying what may legitimately follow from Mr. Crawfurd's conclusions, that there are as many distinct races with distinct origins as there are countries or even provinces with peculiarities of their own. I leave to ethnologists to say whether the present philological and physical researches which Mr. Crawfurd has altogether ignored, and other ethnological inquiries, lead to the conclusion of the unity or plurality of races, or whether more light is still necessary upon the subject.

I shall only make a few remarks suggested by the paper. The races of Europe present a large variety in their size, from the Highlanders to the Laps. The Asiatic races have their Afghans, of the large size, and other races of different sizes. Herodotus writes (vol. iv, p. 354): "For in boldness and warlike spirit the Persians were not a whit inferior to the Greeks;" in another place he says (vol. iii, p. 405): "and in the mid battle, when the Persians themselves and the Sacæ had place, the barbarians were victorious, and broke and pursued the Greeks in the inner country." In the comparison between the Greeks and Persians, Herodotus accounts for the inferiority of the latter in deficiency of discipline and arms only.

Rawlinson, in his *Five Monarchies*, judges from the sculptures that the ancient Aryan race is a noble variety of the human species—tall, graceful, and stately; physiognomy handsome and somewhat resembling the Greek; and that on the authority of Xenophon and Plutarch, the Median and Tremen Persians were remarkable for their stature and beauty. Palgrave calls the Arabs of inhabited lands and organised governments one of the noblest races of earth. (Vol. i, p. 24.) A large portion of the Sikhs and Afghans, and large numbers of Bramans in Central India, have fair complexions and fine features.

We must not also forget, in comparisons of nations, the part which accident, or commonly called luck, plays. We know what part storms played in the defeat of the navy of Xerxes and of the armada of the Spaniards.\* The European lives in a colder and

---

\* Now a single law sometimes fixes the character of a nation for a time for good or evil. What extraordinary changes have been wrought since the recognition of free-trade by this nation! I do not suppose Mr. Crawfurd means the English of the past generation were a different race, because they were protectionists, less tolerant, and in several other respects different from the present generation.

bracing climate. I do not suppose the innate physical character of any European race will enable it to preserve its vigour and strength intact on the plains of India for a long time. The European, says Mr. Crawfurd, enjoys walking, the Asiatic prefers sitting. The Asiatic, when here, enjoys walking as much as any European can do, for he must walk in this climate to preserve his health. The European in India, after the fatigue and heat of the day, often prefers sitting in a cool breeze. With the European dress, and in this climate, sitting with his legs tucked up under him, becomes irksome to the Asiatic also. The rigidity of the muscle of the European is much modified in India. I suppose it is a well known fact to ethnologists that animals are capable of acquiring a large variety of physical characters in different climates, though originally of the same stock. Mr. Crawfurd's statement, that the Jews of Asia are substantially Persian among Persians, Arab among Arabs, and difficult to distinguish from Hindus among Hindus, and that their social advancement in Europe is with the people of the community among which they dwell, tends rather against his theory, showing that external circumstances have modified the character of a people within historic times.

In estimating the character of a people, we must not forget that sometimes single events have given a peculiar direction to their character and history. Had it not been for taxed tea, we do not know whether there would have been a United States now. Had the confederates been victorious, what would have been the future history of the United States and of slavery? Had Britain been connected with the continent of Europe, it is probable that it might have had a different history, either a large European empire, or a province of some other. What change was wrought in the character of the Britons when they complained, "The Picts drive us to the sea, and the sea drives us to the Picts." Was that change in character, the result of the external influence of the Roman civilisation and government, or not?

The one-sided and partial treatment of the subject is best illustrated by the comparison made (page 35) between Greece and the Island of Java. The wide difference between the climate and products of the two countries is admitted, but the legitimate conclusion of its effects in stimulating or checking exertion are ignored; the rest of the comparison might as well not have been made.

The Guzerat-speaking Hindus are eminently commercial, and carry on the most extensive foreign commerce, while just on the other side of the Ghauts and in Concan the Maratha-speaking Hindus are quite uncommercial, except so far as some inland

trade is concerned. Whether these may be considered as two distinct races by Mr. Crawfurd or not I cannot say, but there is this marked difference in their character, arising, to a great extent, from local and historical circumstances, the Guzerat people having commercial connections with Arabia and the West from ancient times.

Again, in Western India there is even now a marked difference in the educational, and therefore intellectual condition of the Mohammedans and Hindus of Concan; though they have the same physiognomy, speak the same language, and, in fact, are originally the same people, there are not half a dozen of these Mohammedans attending the English seminaries, while the Hindus swarm in numbers. Should this state of things continue for some length of time, the difference in the characters of these two portions will be so great that according to Mr. Crawfurd's theory, I suppose they will have to be put down as two distinct races.

I wish I had more time to examine more fully the several points I have touched upon, and also to examine a few more statements of Mr. Crawfurd's paper, especially about Hindu astronomy, music, and architecture, and Chinese literature and character. The ethnologist should study man in all his bearings, and make due allowances for every cause of disturbance. Mr. Crawfurd's conclusion may be right or wrong, but, with every deference to him, all I wish to submit to the Society is that the evidence produced is not only not sufficient but defective in itself, inasmuch as it is superficial, and several statements are not quite correct.

I have not made these remarks for the pleasure of objecting, or simply for the sake of defending the Asiatics; truth cannot be gainsaid, and I hope I shall be the last person to deny it wherever it is proved to exist, no matter in howsoever unpleasant a form. The sole business of science, as I understand it, is to seek the truth and to hail it wherever it is found, and not to bend and adapt facts to a foregone conclusion.

---